

Remarks

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment claims 1- 8, and 12-20 are amended. Amended claims 1, 4, 12, 15, 18 and 20 are supported by the original specification, for example in paragraphs [0101] and [0102]. Claims 2 and 13 are supported by the original specification, for example in paragraphs [0088] and [0089]. Claims 8 and 17 are amended to correct grammatical errors. The specification is amended to replace attorney docket numbers with application serial numbers. The abstract is amended to correct a typographical error. No new matter is added

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representatives by Examiner Shikhman in the May 15, 2007 interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-13, 15, 16 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0081355 (Takahashi).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Takahashi does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of the pixel comparison of the present claims and therefore fails to anticipate the claims.

A. Regarding Claims 1, 8-12, 15, 16 and 18-20

Takahashi does not teach or suggest assigning a current pixel to a blob based on at least three pixels. Box 1014 of Figure 12 of Takahashi shows the edge strength of exactly two adjacent pixels that are on opposing sides of the object pixel with respect to the edge direction of the pixel.

In the present application, see paragraphs [0101] and [0102], the tri state edge continuity signal (TEC) of a current pixel is compared to the edge continuity signal of at least

three adjacent pixels. The claimed subject matter also has the added benefit of efficiently recognizing diagonally oriented blobs [0102].

Therefore, since Takahashi teaches comparison only to two adjacent pixels, Takahashi does not teach or suggest the comparison to at least three adjacent pixels as in the present claims (e.g., top adjacent pixel, top left adjacent pixel, left adjacent pixel).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims are thus respectfully requested.

B. Regarding Claims 2 and 13

In paragraph [0104] of Takahashi, vector calculations are completed for each pixel adjacent to the object pixel. These calculations are based on color differences. Takahashi makes no mention of luminance.

Luminance is the initial attribute used to determine the differences between pixels. See paragraphs [0088] and [0089] of the present application. The pixel in the window having the highest luminance value and the pixel in the window having the lowest luminance value are used to normalize data for the current pixel.

Since Takahashi teaches only the use of color difference, Takahashi does not teach or suggest the use of luminance in addition to color. Therefore Takahashi does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 2 and 13.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims are thus respectfully requested.

C. Regarding Claims 4, 6 and 7

The Patent Office's rejection of claim 4 includes "The limitation 'within a line of the pixel' does not exclude curved lines; it only excludes lines that do not intersect the pixel." Applicants submit that the Patent Office has misunderstood the use of the word line in this claim. Applicants submit that "line" in context refers to a line of pixels that may or may not

have any color data associated therewith. In the present application, each successive pixel is evaluated in the order that they occur. Applicants submit that amended claim 4 has made this clear.

Takahashi does not teach or suggest the comparison to three adjacent pixels as in claims 1 and 4. Therefore, Takahashi does not teach or suggest the limitations of claims 1 and 4.

Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

D. Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that Takahashi does not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 3 and 14 contain allowable subject matter. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Denis A. Backer
Registration No. 58,988

JAO:DAB/hs

Date: May 17, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
--